

## REMARKS

Claims 2, 8, 11, 13, 14, 16-18, 20, 28, and 36-47 are in this application and are presented for consideration. Claims 2, 8, 11, 13, 14, 16-18, 20 and 28 have been amended, and new claims 36-47 have been added.

The claims have been amended to address the Examiner's rejections, and to further highlight and more clearly point out the important features of the invention.

Original independent claim 31 has been rejected as being obvious over Danforth '066 in view of Hietala.

With this amendment applicant has canceled claim 31 and added new independent claim 36 which sets forth first and second horizontally spaced apart end walls. In the embodiment of figure 2, the end walls are shown on the left and right of the container 9. A suction duct is set forth as arranged in the first end wall, and an inlet duct is set forth as arranged in the second end wall. The inlet duct, the suction duct and a pump are set forth as generating a water flow along the bottom wall of the container along the longitudinal extension of the container, and to collect the waste. In the embodiment of figure 2, the flow is from the right end wall and inlet duct 29a to the left end wall and suction duct 25.

Applicant has reviewed Danforth and Hietala, and finds no teaching nor suggestion of such horizontally spaced apart end walls, inlet duct, suction duct and pump. Therefore the combination of applied prior art fails to anticipate all the features of new independent claim 36.

In the rejection of claim 12, the rejection states that Hietala discloses a recirculation duct approximately opposite an intake opening. Applicant has reviewed Hietala, especially figure 2, and notes that any suction ducts or intake ducts are not in horizontally spaced end walls. Instead it appears that any inlet and outlet ducts are in walls that are in the same horizontal location, and are not horizontally spaced apart. Therefore Hietala clearly does not describe ducts in horizontally spaced end walls.

New independent claim 44 also sets forth a suction duct and inlet duct arranged on first and second end walls where the suction pump flows a fluid along the bottom of the container from the inlet duct to the suction duct. As described above, these features are not present in the combination of Danforth and Hietala, and therefore claim 44 defines over this combination.

New independent claim 42 also sets forth first and second horizontally spaced end walls and a suction duct arranged in one of the end walls. Applicant finds no teaching nor suggestion in the combination of Danforth and Hietala of a suction duct in one of two horizontally spaced end walls. Instead it appears in both of these references, that any suction duct is arranged in a bottom center of a chamber. Claim 42 therefore also defines over the combination.

It is applicant's position that while Danforth and Hietala both remove wastepaper, the references perform this operation fundamentally differently. In Danforth, the wastepaper is physically broken up, and mixed with water as soon as it is received, while in Hietala, the wastepaper is first transported by a vacuum through a duct work to a separator, and then to another separator, as particularly described in the abstract. The references are also different with regard to the type of wastepaper which they process. Danforth processes entire sheets that

have broken and are being continuously fed until the processing line can be shut down. This results in a tremendous amount of wastepaper occurring occasionally. Hietala on the other hand, removes trimmings when paper is trimmed on a processing line. In Hietala, wastepaper is continuously being generated but the amount is very much less than a full sheet in full production. Applicant finds no indication that Hietala would be able to handle the tremendous amount of wastepaper that occasionally occurs when an entire sheet has broken, and the processing line continues to operate. In fact, it is quite clear that increasing the size of Hietala to occasionally handle a full sheet would be impractical and inefficient. Therefore the person of ordinary skill in the art would not be led to combine Danforth with Hietala. It is applicant's position therefore that while Hietala has benefits, there is no indication that the structure of Hietala would result in the same benefits if applied to the problem addressed by Danforth. Combining the two references is therefore not suggested or even straightforward.

New independent claim 42 also sets forth an air suction duct having a suction duct inlet in communication with the container, where the suction duct inlet is separated from the pressurized water nozzles by a separating wall. The rejection of the previous independent claims uses Hietala to disclose a suction duct. However Hietala does not describe suction ducts separate from pressurized water nozzles by a separating wall. Instead it appears that any suction duct in Hietala is arranged adjacent to pressurized water nozzles. Therefore the combination of the applied prior art fails to anticipate all the features of new independent claim 42. New independent claim 42 therefore further defines over the prior art.

As described above, it is applicant's position that would not be obvious to use any

suction structure of Hietala in Danforth, because of the difference in the volume of paper handled by Hietala and Danforth. In Hietala, the suction or vacuum is used to transport trimmings which are almost by definition very thin and very long. Trying to use the suction or vacuum of Hietala to transport an entire broken sheet as in Danforth would be very impractical. To use the suction or vacuum of Hietala in the manner disclosed by the present application, is a different use of vacuum than described in Hietala. It is only applicant who discloses using suction in a pulper that processes an entire sheet of waste material. Therefore it would not be obvious to use any suction in Hietala which transports trimmings in a pulper which processes entire sheets. Claim 42 therefore further defines over the prior art.

It should also be noted that Hietala and Danforth cannot be combined together for the very simple reason that Danforth requires an open container, i.e. a container at room pressure, whereas Hietala actually teaches a vacuum waste separator in the form of a cyclone. The two concepts cannot be combined. It would be illogical for a person skilled in the art to isolate features from the teaching of Hietala that are specific to a cyclone separator and adopt them in a open container device according to Danforth. Furthermore, there is no suggestion to include water recirculation in Danforth.

Even if one takes the (wrong) view that Danforth and Hietala are obviously combinable, such combination would still not result in the claimed invention of new claim 36. Indeed, the only obvious or suggested way to combine the teaching of Hietala concerning water recirculation with the teaching of Danforth would be to recirculate part of the water from the bottom of the container of Danforth and feed it to the water nozzles. This, however is not what

is disclosed in the present application.

What is now claimed in claim 36 is that an additional water feed duct is provided, in addition to the pressurized nozzles, this is done in order to generate a larger water and waste flow along the bottom of the container from one end wall to the other end wall. The prior art does not teach nor suggest any additional water feed duct provided at the bottom of an open container to remove waste. It is only applicant who discloses this feature, and therefore claim 36 further defines over the prior art.

The new dependent claims set forth additional features such as:

- The use of a chopper pump. Nowhere is there any suggestion to use a chopper pump in a pulper to combine chopping and pumping in addition to the effect of the pressurized water coming from the nozzles;
- Air suction, in addition to water circulation;
- Inclined bottom of the container to enhance water circulation and facilitate waste removal.

Applicant finds no teaching nor suggestion of these additional features in the applied prior art, and therefore these new claims further define over the prior art.

Original independent claim 31 had also been rejected as being obvious over Doelle '367 in view of Hietala.

Applicant has reviewed Doelle, and finds it to be very similar to Danforth. Therefore it is applicant's position that the new independent claims define over the combination of Doelle and Hietala for the same reasons as the new independent claims define over Danforth and

Hietala.

If the Examiner has any comments or suggestions which would further favorable prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to contact applicant's representative by telephone to discuss possible changes.

At this time applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of this application, and based on the above amendments and remarks, respectfully solicits allowance of this application.

Respectfully submitted  
for Applicant,



By: \_\_\_\_\_

Theobald Dengler  
Registration No. 34,575  
McGLEW AND TUTTLE, P.C.

TD:pl  
71071-18

DATED: December 12, 2006  
BOX 9227 SCARBOROUGH STATION  
SCARBOROUGH, NEW YORK 10510-9227  
(914) 941-5600

SHOULD ANY OTHER FEE BE REQUIRED, THE PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE IS HEREBY REQUESTED TO CHARGE SUCH FEE TO OUR DEPOSIT ACCOUNT 13-0410.